

REMARKS

This Amendment is prepared in response to the Office action mailed on 18 June 2007 (Paper No. 20070529) and the Office communication mailed on 16 August 2007 (Paper No. 20070708). Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-36 will be pending in this application.

Claim 11 has been objected to for the reasons stated in section 5 on page 2 of the Office Action and by this Amendment, the dependency of claim 11 has been revised in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claims 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 USC 112 for the reasons stated in section 7 on page 3 of the Office Action and by this Amendment, claims 37 and 38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter.

The remaining claims have been variously rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Tadamitsu (JP 2002-334685) or Masataka (JP 07-169506) for the reasons stated in sections 9 and 10 on pages 3-6 of the Office Action. In addition, various claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Tadamitsu in view of Cho (US 2003/0077484) are obvious over Masataka in view of Tadamitsu for the reasons stated in sections 13 and 14 on pages 7-9 of the Office Action. These rejections are traversed for the following reasons:

All of the independent claims in the present application recite a lead plate adapted to be pressed into either one aperture of the cap plate or one cavity in an external bottom surface of the can.

On the other hand, none of the three applied references teach or suggest a lead plate adapted to be pressed into either one aperture of the cap plate or one cavity in an external bottom surface of the can.

Rather, they all teach welding a lead plate to either the cap plate or external bottom surface of the can.

As noted in paragraph [0009] of the present application, by pressing the lead plate into either one aperture of the cap plate or one cavity in an external bottom surface of the can rather than welding the lead plate improves reliability and prevents leakage of the electrolytic solution caused by laser welding.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present application are patentable over the cited art, taken either alone or in combination, and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the

PATENT
P56999

claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56999
Date: 11/8/07
I.D.: REB/HMZ